Meeting in Boston, Thursday, January 10th, 1963.

M-397.

Mr. Nyland: It would be nice, you know, if we knew where we left off last time I was here. And by the way, I will try to make it regularly now that we can count on it, that I will try to come here every four weeks. So that ought to give you also a chance to arrange it for the three times that I'm not here to have a definite program, something that you start out with, that you try to adhere to, and that you do the first, the second, and the third evening so that there is a little sequence in that. And it requires some planning. I think you have to try to get together on that and see what you ought to do. You still meet on Sunday? Or did that fall a little bit?

Margo Lockwood: There's about, there's from three to five that come, I mean that are present.

Mr. Nyland: That's a good time to discuss it and see what kind of plan you would make. For instance you may want to read something. You may want to read something specific, a certain number of pages out of a book; or you may want to talk about a certain subject, and then probably read different books on that subject. And something of that kind has to be constantly as a line, you might say as a line of organizing. Otherwise it becomes too haphazard. Also regarding when I come, which I'm sorry cannot be so often, but we have to concentrate then on an evening like this to do as much as we can in an evening, and have questions that you have been thinking about or have come up, and where you feel you would like to - I wouldn't call it have a little bit more elucidation - but in any event where you have a chance of talking about it or to get a little closer to the idea, or a little more understanding of the direction in which one ought to work.

Because by this time you are now working and you have experiences. And you have to talk about the experience, what it is now that you find in yourself, that there are obstacles that you want to overcome when it is worthwhile to overcome them, or at points where you probably feel that it isn't worthwhile to do any work because it doesn't lead anywhere - things of that kind. What questions are there?

Margo Lockwood: I have a question that I've had for three weeks, that is very important to me, and I couldn't come to the conclusion, the answer myself. During self-observation which has become stretched into longer periods of time for me, two things happen - one of two things happens. Sometimes the sense of myself seems to come from within my body, says centered in my body, and I'm right in my body, and I'm sensing, experiencing being alive. Other times when I wish to observe myself, a faculty - I put it outside of myself as if across the room, as if behind myself - and this kind of observation gives a different taste to me than the first kind which seems to come from my heart or my solar plexus, or within my body as a vibrating thing. I want to know whether, - which is the more proper, or whether they're both part of the same phenomenon. Or whether I should try, which I feel now, I feel I should try to

externalize in the way I mentioned as being outside myself walking or sitting. Which is, which is it that is more correct?

Mr. Nyland: If I were not here, and you had this kind of a question come up among you, what would you answer? What is your own viewpoint? Margo has a question. It is an important question because it is something that of course will come up, and it is an experience which sometimes cannot be understood unless you know the direction in which you really have to think about it. What would be your reaction to a question of that kind? Does it correspond to any kind of an experience you've had yourself?

Answer: (Diana?) I find it hard to observe myself like you said from above as if you're looking down or from behind. When I observe myself it's easier if I sort of feel in my body, feel myself and my actions and things, but I can't see myself like you said, externally I can't.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you see, Margo is talking about two things. One corresponds to what your experience is, and the other is as if something outside of her is seeing herself, which is an experience that you don't know or at least don't experience. How would you answer her question? You can say that if you don't have that experience, then you really cannot judge about it.

Answer: Right.

Mr. Nyland: So you cannot say that it is good or bad or that it belongs or not. Do you for yourself however think that that kind of an experience would be possible, and if it is possible, where would it be located, or what would do it?

Answer: Well, I should think it would mean more work, more observing myself, more that I could do - - -

Mr. Nyland: No, not necessarily. There are different ways of coming to the same conclusion, you know; there are different roads. And it depends on the type of a person, how they function, what is predominant in them, sometimes the mind, sometimes the feeling, which then will determine the road they will follow in order to come to the same conclusion of an awareness. And even if one doesn't know for oneself by experience, you can very well say that, 'yes, there ought to be another road, although it may be closed to me.' Ed, you had - - ?

Ed Luttrup: A question?

Mr. Nyland: No, we're still talking about Margo's fundamental one about observing.

Ed Luttrup: Well, I know that in the findings of Ouspensky and Gurdjieff that it's an ultimate aim, that is I believe it is an ultimate aim, to be able to be outside of oneself, to observe oneself from the outside. I know that this is something that we strive for. I don't believe that I am capable of observing myself from the outside, and I don't, am not able to comment on it except to say that I feel that I do have much more time and much more work to do on myself before this becomes possible for me, if it

becomes possible for me.

Mr. Nyland: Virginia, have you any idea?

Virginia: I think there is definitely a very, I think she introduced - - - strong emotion - - - (couldn't understand the rest of the answer.)

Mr. Nyland: It sometimes is very difficult to put in words because it is an experience in the first place that is new. In the second place the attitude that one has towards it and starting from a certain place in oneself to try to become aware does not mean that I get immediately the same kind of a result even if I for myself try to do certain things at different times. You see?

Margo Lockwood: The one thing that I did discover was that when I deliberately wished to work to observe myself for long enough, the experience was that of being behind myself observing, and it was more difficult and it was longer. But it was more difficult and a more total, gripping kind of work than just feeling myself as I was walking or doing the dishes. So what I felt was that probably it was something more to be worked on, you know, for myself. But I'm not sure, and there was no way I could really tell except by asking a few others. I mentioned it to Paul; I mentioned it to George. But since you were coming, they both said to ask you. They thought it was better.

Mr. Nyland: You see, the whole question centers around the result that one wishes to obtain, which is a sense of awareness. And the question is, when one is aware what actually is there? That is, what is this that I call an awareness, totally if I wanted to describe it? What are the different factors that are involved in thia state or condition or concept of a person being aware? Aware to what in the first place? And in the second place who is aware of what? Now I am aware of myself. Myself is my body. Myself of course includes the different functions; it includes my mind and it includes my feeling. And when I say I become aware of myself it is as if someone else is outside of me becoming aware of the presence of myself. Sometimes I say, "I am present to myself." But then I mix it up a little bit because I say, "I am present to myself", and again what is this "I" when I say, "I am aware"? So we have to be very careful in keeping on defining the same thing the same way, and when I say once "I" and I use it again later that I mean the same thing with that "I". Because I cannot say I use now "I", and then a little later the "I" has become "it".

So let's first see when I'm aware, I say now, "I am aware." As I know myself and again I say, "I know myself." What is it in me that knows of my own existence? In the beginning that "I" that knows is my head. It is in my head that the thinking process takes place, comes to a certain concept of the realization of the existence of something. And I say the existence in the first place is that my body exists simply because I am aware of the existence of my body having a certain volume and a certain density so that if I put my hand on my knee, something in me becomes aware of the existence of my knee because there is a contact between my hand and my knee. And that fact of existing is registered in my mind. And it becomes then a concept and I translate it by saying, "I am aware,

something in me of my mind is aware of the fact that my knee exists."

So this is the simplest way of starting to talk about an awareness. "I find myself," - also a certain statement. I realize I sit in a chair. The realization that I sit in a chair is registered somewhere in me. But this fact of seeing myself as I am - and now I want to include the possibility of that what I see I accept without any wish for changing - means that it is as if something outside of me becomes aware of my existence as if it is a hand from someone else putting that hand on my knee, becomes aware of the existence of my knee simply because my knee has as I say volume or density. Therefore in the first place I know that it is not someone else because the conclusion that I reach in my mind is something that still belongs to me, and when I continue to say, "I am aware," I have to remember that it is as if someone outside becomes aware of myself, knowing however at the same time that I am inside becoming aware of the existence of myself as if I am being observed from the outside.

That is one thing. Now the question of this awareness: how do I reach knowledge in general? In many cases it is a knowledge that is reached through my mind as a mental process. But many times I reach a knowledge through an entirely different process than my mind. I become aware, for instance, of certain things that belong to a certain class of having a hunch or a premonition, or something that I say, "I feel it but I cannot express it in words." That is, I come to a realigation of certain things existing, and it is registered in my mind in exactly the same way as if I see it, but I am aware of the existence without having gone through the process of a mental seeing or perceiving. And it is this kind of inner perception of something that is abstract which does not lend itself to any particular kind of description like a concrete object that nevertheless gives me in my mind ultimately the realization of the existence, and it has reached me through another channel. And very often it is a channel of my feeling.

At the same time it can reach me as a channel through a physical means. When I bump my head I become aware of the existence of the wall by means of my physical body receiving a certain shock, or, if you wish, a certain sensation which is translated in my head, and I say, "There must be something there because I bumped my head."

So there are three ways of becoming aware of the existence of something; and depending now entirely on the kind of object that I have in mind, I will use one way or another. Now coming back to that what I am and I become aware of my existence, I now have to see that the object of myself is not only my body but also consists of a certain thought process or a certain feeling. And I call it simply three-centered being. And when I say, "I become aware," I become aware of all three centers. Regarding my physical body, I become aware of the existence by means of my mind. Regarding my feeling as a concept, I become aware of the existence of my feeling not with my mind but with something that is almost as if it is in an abstract form coming to the realization of the existence of the feeling without being able to describe it. And exactly the - you understand what I mean? There is a difference in the object that I now observe. The object I observe consists of three different parts. One part I can conceive of and I can register with my mind as existing, that is, my physical body in its behavior forms.

Now when I become aware of my feeling existing, I don't see it, I don't come in contact with it. I know the existence of it because I register in my mind also the same statement that something in me feels. But it is not a mental process by means of which I reach that statement although ultimately it is registered in my mind as a fact of my feeling existing.

Regarding thought processes, it is very difficult to say that I reach it by means of a mental process because my thought process is so mixed up with the process of recording, since I use the same kind of instrument for it; that only much later when there is a separation between mind functioning one way as registering existences, and the mind functioning in the form of thought or associative processes - only when these two have become separated sufficiently to become independent of each other - then I can say I reach a conclusion of my mental processes as thinking by means of my mind becoming aware of a process of thinking existing.

Now this includes that when I become aware of the existence of myself, that I must have at least two phases of coming to the realization of myself. One is: I am in my presence as body, and this is mental, and this is as if there is an "I" observing my body. And it is then as if there is a split between that what I now call "I" as represented by the possibility of my mind functioning in the way in which I call "I" objectively, and "It" which is my body functioning in its ordinary way as I know it. This time I see my body, I become aware of the existence of a center which I call feeling, and I become aware also ot the existence of a certain substance in my head which I say is a mental process, which goes on, a thought. This is a mental way of seeing myself, "I" and "it". And in order to become more objective, I personify something as outside of me simply because I cannot as yet register sufficiently something that is still part of me as if it is separate from me. I use the idea of personification simply because it is easier for me.

Take for instance the question of God or religion. It is extremely difficult to consider God as something existing in a spiritual world without any form. I can say, 'yes, it is a force which I cannot define', or I can say, it is a rate of vibration or it is a form of energy. But there are very few people who will continue to want to pray to that kind of a concept which for them is not clear enough and much too vague. And particularly when it has to do with a relationship towards one's God, it is not sufficient to say, "I have a feeling and I am guided by this feeling," because at certain times the feeling is not strong enough to have any particular effect as a guide. For that reason most religions will personify in the shape of a person or in a person that kind of ideal form which they consider God.

If you take the Christian religion, it has to be as if God, usually pictured as a Jew with a beard sitting on a throne somewhere in Heaven and directing everything, and all the allegories that are connected with it: the birds that will fall down because He wills it or He doesn't. He directs this and that and so forth, sends us good weather or not, who sees us as we are and smiles on us, and sometimes has wrath against the people and wants to punish them. And all the rest simply means that I have to have a concept that is much more satisfying to me than just in a general way thinking it is a Spirit. Only when I go further into that I will assume that God continues to exist, but then in order to satisfy

my feeling I have to introduce something similar to my feeling, and I call it Holy Ghost. That is how religions in general start, and it doesn't matter if it's Christian religion, Buddhism or any of the others. All the Greek mythology is filled with gods which simply have a personified form, who live, who have also certain qualities of human beings; and I assume that whatever is God is like a human in order to bring it down to a level of my own concept and my own perception.

Now if I see the object of myself as also consisting of feeling, in order to come to the realization of that feeling I have to introduce into the possibility of perceiving it something for me as if it is like feeling which then can meet my own feeling on its own ground. This means that at certain times when I'm particularly interested in a certain form of being, that is having an attitude or a wish, a deep wish to become aware of myself, then in that feeling I have to have something that recognizes the feeling; and it is not my mind. In that way I say, "I am present to myself." But this time by "I", I mean I have a feeling of its nearness. And it is much closer then to the possibility that I am affected by an atmosphere which is surrounding me, which in some way or other touches me without being able to perceive it, that is with my eyes. So the more spiritual my particular awareness takes on its coloration of a perception of my own existence, the more I will come closer to the acceptance of a feeling existing in it which is still me, but this time being recognized as an emotional quality, nevertheless giving me at the same time the fact of an existence just as clearly and just as truthfully as that what reaches me through my mind.

So the answer is, both are right. It depends on what state one is in. What will happen ultimately is another question. I become aware of the nearness of myself, not only emotionally but also physically. That is, there is something in every person which constitutes his atmosphere. And when I, that is that what separates out and starts in the beginning by trying to become a faculty of objectivity seeing myself, that is the "I" that gradually will grow out of a concept of what I have called many times the Tescoano, that is the observatory with the observer on one end and that what is being observed on the other end - so that gradually out of this concept something grows that I call my "I", and this "I" then being present to "it" becomes at times aware of the existence of "it" physically because of the atmosphere which surrounds this "it".

So now we have three ways of how I become aware of myself dependent on the three centers and dependent on the three possibilities of functioning of my mind in accordance with a pure mental quality, in accordance with a more pure than usual emotional quality, and in connection with what I have called a sensing quality originating in my physical body but also being registered as a sensation in my "I". And the division between "I" and "it" becomes now entirely dependent on how such observations take place. The more the observation is impartial, the more the separation between "I" and "it" exists. So the real objectivity is now dependent not only on the fact of observing, but it becomes dependent on the introduction of the second requirement, which is impartiality. And the further I now get away as if I am not at all part of "it" the more impartial I become, so finally as a result of the acknowledgement of the existence of myself at the moment of observing is already included in

impartiality because I cannot be impartial unless I observe at the moment of my existence.

These are the three things that are linked together, and one cannot be separated from the other. The resultant however is that "I", developing more and more because of the conscious effort which is made in me - and now I don't say it is made in my "I" or it is made in "it", - it simply means that part of me starts to grow because of the energy becoming available by the wish to wake up, that because of that this "I", having now three functions of becoming aware of "it", starts in its own development to form an entity in exactly the same way as "it" which is my body with the feelings and with my mind also under the influence of "I", becomes an entity. The further "I" am away, the more "it" becomes one. And in the process of going away, "I" remaining functioning in a three-fold way becomes one. When "I" becomes one, it is a Being. Then the relationship regarding "it" is: Master, "I," and "it," servant.

So the ultimate picture simply means that there is something that then functions independently of "it." "It" continues to function in ordinary life. "I" functions with its feet and heart and mind of its own in another kind of an atmosphere. So that then the relationship is: I'm inside and I'm outside; and I'm constantly with this body functioning in life. And because "I" is made up of component parts corresponding to the component parts of my physical body, "I" is able to give direct orders to any one of my three centers to function in accordance with the requirements which "I" can see and "it" cannot see. You understand?

Margo: If I had been able to remember your description of the tetrahedron and when you talked about the sociological - - ? - - if I had remembered and applied, then it would have helped - - -

Mr. Nyland: It would have helped because it would have given you the question of the triangle, but what I call in that the sociological end is ordinary functioning of the triangle in the ordinary world. It has nothing to do with the "I".

Margo: - - - that's the point that looks at the - - - -

Mr. Nyland: No, this is an application of the law of three to "I" as a possible development into a Being. And the relationship that is then between Being, body, it, and as relationship being helped together by what is simply called "Master-servant" relationship. So that in the functioning of that "I" and "it" on earth the relationship becomes apparent in the activities of "it". And in this life performance or manifestation again there is a third fusion of three elements: "I", higher qualities; "it", ordinary earth qualities, and the relationship between which is then a neutralizing force. This neutralizing force is not "I" and neither is it "it". But it is the outgrowth of that what is within one as magnetic center, and which does not belong to earth, but cannot leave earth unless it has a vehicle for going to a different kind of level. So that again ultimately out of that relation of "I", "it", and the neutralizer as represented by magnetic center, the fusion of such three will make God living then for anyone now living on earth on the planetary level.

In reality the process is a little more complicated than this because it is not a relationship 1,2,3. It is a relationship 1,3,2. And it is comparable to a relationship of three bodies, physical, intellectual and emotional. Or it is a relationship like earth, sun, planets. So one must not look at it as something that flows easily like evolution go in one line. It is this: "Reculler pour mieux sauter." You understand that? It is to return, reculler, to go back in order to jump better. So that the process of evolution is 1,3,2; 4,3,5 instead of 1,2,3,4,5. Otherwise it is exactly the same as in the triangle being formed out of do-re-mi and becoming one, and then serving as the starting point for the next triangle. So that when I say, first "it" in its attempts to become one in regards to that what is "I" which in the first place is represented by the faculty of objectivity in one's mind, "it" becoming one under that influence, means that the three centers which are now functioning any way and any old way they wish, start to separate out from each other; and then having loosened its relationship between them, are now combined under the influence of "I" into one unit.

The second step is that "I", starting with one's mind, has to allow the possibility of observing by means of feeling, and also having to allow the possibility of becoming aware of the existence of "it" by means of a certain sensing relationship. Because of this the "I" starts to develop into a more full-grown entity, again becoming one, and is represented by Being having understanding, having higher emotional quality, and having a sensity and a faculty of sensing which is permanent. So the awareness of a Being on a different level is assured as permanent regarding the "it" which is not as yet permanent, but will under the influence of the higher force start to function as a servant.

The third step is the relationship between "it" and "I" into a totality of a unit like the three bodies would combine, physical, intellectual and emotional in becoming one; then the existence of that what is in between covered by one and covered by the other is overlapping but not as yet completed totally, although the three bodies as they are related come to a certain point where the si-do of the intellectual body should still be overbridged if the totality of that person dies totally on earth. If he doesn't die on earth, he continues to live in Kesdjan and then his intellectual body becomes his second body. But then again there is no reason to go into detail about that.

Margo: - - it - - magnetic center is seeing "I" - - -

Mr. Nyland: Becomes the neutralizer.

Margo: It is the neutralizer but it is in the same relationship as the feeling center is in the body.

Mr. Nyland: That's right, that's right. It has in it, you see, always the second one, that is, the one that is in between always is the spearhead; it is the motivating force, and it is by means of its own existence the possibility of contact with a higher level. It means that in itself as quality it is the most important part of one. Although the beginning will be in one's mind, the ultimate result of Being is dependent on one's feelings. And therefore if you say,

"Which one is better?", both are equally good; but if you say, "Which one is more valuable?", the last. Because if everything else fails, your feelings still will hold on. My feelings will not allow for a contradiction of failing. It is in the principle of hope that one constantly finds even if everything looks intellectually as impossible, or that physically one has reached the limit, that there is still hope in one's heart. This hope is never still. And it is really the center of one's life. It is represented in one's feeling. The constant wish, the constant love for work is the most dominating factor in work.

Intellectually as concepts something that is very clear and also beautiful and fits logically together will never produce in me the result of wishing to continue to work. It will never produce in anyone else the wish to work. The only way by which anyone else can be reached is in an emotional quality, and for that I have to use the mind and the body. I have to use the thought process, the clarity, the logic, whatever is involved in any kind of a concept. By means of the body it has ~~it has~~ to be used for formulation, for the forming of words, by means of a voice, by means of a certain facial expression, by means of a posture, by means of certain movements. All of that together with the clarity of mind produces in the expression of oneself and in the effect of someone else something of an emotional quality in which both intellect and instinctive are combined. So that the dynamic quality which is there, which is flowing, is quite different from the static statements of the mind or even static statements of the body in sensing.

And the resultant always must be that it has to have warmth, that is dynamically wishing to go, to be on the move, regardless of whatever the intellect will say, or whatever the instinctive will almost command on its own. So that when you come to a distinction between the three centers, they're all important, all three. All three have to be developed. Physically we're more developed than the others. Nevertheless they all three have to enter into the possibility of harmony and becoming one unit.

But the one that has the more value for the maintenance of ideas and constancy of work is the emotions. Although the beginning is not an emotional one. It's only expressed in the little bit of a wish to become clear regarding work. If it is not so, that is, if the emotion continues to be predominant in the beginning, one goes on the wrong road. One goes only by feeling, one goes by gushing, by being affected by the possibilities of work, by hoping that if one only is in the presence of it, it will come, and it never will lead to any real work. In order for my physical body to become what it ought to be, I have to strike first the note as represented by number three, before number two can develop. The note that has to be struck regarding work is a clarity of concept of what is meant by work, and the understanding of what is meant by objectivity, an understanding for myself of what is meant by being awake, or the difference between sleep and being awake, or what is meant by awareness. And only when that is clear, and I have started to put to practice what I know in my mind with my physical body, that my feeling will start to enter.

But when once and for all the clarity is there, I can say, "goodbye" to my mind because I know now. But now I go, and this is

the propelling force of my feeling. I only say this because one is so often misled by work, even with the best of intentions, that being exposed to work, and particularly when one has already a certain form of admiration or respect or perhaps awe, that it stops at that point. And then the assumption is that if I just do a little bit more, or try a little bit, that maybe perhaps tomorrow I will wake up. But I don't even say that I will wake up. I have a feeling that I just can sit down at the feet of Gamaliel and everything will be wonderful. Many of the gurus in India produce this kind of - they come and sit at the feet of Maharshi - and they attend to his wishes. He wants a cup of coffee; here it is. He wants something else; here it is. You want to make his bed; here it is. You see, the devotion which very often is extended to a holy man, can sometimes - - Little fools including men or women, but mostly women because they are a little bit hysterically inclined, think that by just loving without knowing, they will get somewhere. And they will not get somewhere unless they have a certain standpoint from which they will start loving. Then they will get somewhere.

Take a question of a creation of an artist. An artist may have love for whatever he wishes to do and whatever he wishes to express, and he can get to a certain point. But very often he feels that he is handicapped by a technique. And if they are then honest, they will go and get a technique and then use their love. If they are not honest, they will continue to use their love and make it as awkward as possible in order to distinguish themselves. Take painting, take music at the present time; take many things that people will pursue. But they cannot do it because they don't, they have not as yet gone through a certain amount of schooling.

Now of course the great danger is that when I go through the schooling of my intellect, that I crush my emotion. So in exactly the same way, although it is necessary for work to have knowledge, if I extend my desire for knowledge too far without starting at the proper time to introduce my love for work, I will also become a lopsided person. So there are pitfalls one way or the other.

And the only royal way is to find out first what it is about. The second place, to have certain concepts of what is meant by objectivity or awareness. The third is the application of such concepts in real life. The fourth is the introduction of a feeling wishing to continue in that application of such concepts. And gradually because of this increased wish based on the experience which one then has on account of the application of knowledge in physical relationships, one can gradually start to throw out all the technique and all the knowledge, and continue with feeling. It's a very strange thing to say, but at the same time it is the truth. You play piano: there is technique, there is structure, there is harmony, there is a melody, there is touch - and one plays. But at certain times there is nothing of that kind, but only sound. And it's very interesting because technique doesn't count any more. It's then as if technique, touch, and all is directed from somewhere else. So this question of emotion becomes ultimately of extreme importance because it's the only time by means of which something of my ordinary life can actually be forgotten, and the existence then with that what is now my ordinary functioning intellectually and instinctively not being as important as the other, in the presence of my emotion, being more and more, and becoming more and more refined, the existence of the other centers will follow the lead of my emotion.

And then a very interesting thing happens because since the intellect and the instinctive part lose their identity, the fusion that takes place because of the emotion becomes comparable to the fusion of harmony resulting from fusion on account of work. And the result that then is reached by the road of emotion is exactly the same as the reaching of a result of objectivity by means of work. So that certain persons, artists who have lived before and who have reached in their lives, on account of suffering, certain conditions, certain techniques which they worked out, have come at times to a realization of something out of this world.

Margo: - - - I can't get over, - - - I've never had anything like that - - -

Mr. Nyland: Well, you see, it is true, how then at such a time there is that kind of a contact. When, for instance, I've said it a few times, when Beethoven takes Schiller's poem of "To the Joy", and he writes in such simplicity a few notes with a little melody; and there is a choir, and there is every voice represented, and the orchestra with everything taking on this little melody. And then at a certain moment there is another choir of children. I don't know if you have ever heard it, have you? If you have, then you know what it is. There is a certain moment in this particular symphony where everything has been put on a level as if it is a foundation, and it is filled with this music of ; I don't know if you know it? There it is totally, and then at the moment the choir of the little children come out in exactly the same way almost in contrast, but augmenting that what is there with their metallic voice, not their emotional voices, but the quality of a voice which is entirely different from this; and which helps this to overbridge something as if it comes into a new world. And it is exactly then what Schiller says: "Freude schöne Götter Funken, Töchter aus Elysium." Elysium: it is then at that time Heaven; it is not earth.

Well, there are of course instances of that kind in all kinds of art. Elocution, statements made at certain times by certain people, feelings that are expressed sometimes by means of painting, by means of certain things that are at that moment; and sometimes Gurdjieff has called this an 'obyvatel'. It is his love for his work, not his dexterity. It is the love for his work which simply enables a simple man to reach at a certain time as if he is, let's say, walking with God. Sometimes in the music of, I've mentioned it, Cézar Franck, sometimes in Die Meistersinger of Wagner and the so-called Preislied.

And there are a few other instances: sometimes Michelangelo. You can see sometimes in some of his drawings certain things that are not at all earthly. Take Bacon in some of his statements; take some of Shakespeare - not his regular plays but his poetic, his real, real poetry. Take certain statements that are made almost unknowingly by someone repeating that what someone else has said, like in the "Sayings of the Buddha". Or things of that kind that belong entirely to an entirely different world than we know it, and we are in the presence of such, we call it, objective art. But it is the production of something by ordinary human beings who probably were not conscious, but who were, because of their insistence of living in that way - like the mystics constantly insist in living in that way - that makes Jacob Böehme have contact, or Swedenborg, or Meister Eckhart or William Law.

People of that kind live at such a time in a different kind of world of contact that has something of a different kind of a quality. This is the most marvellous thing of a human being, because it means that a human being in reality is not a being destined for earth alone. The maintenance of earth, organic kingdom, is of course dependent on the existence of human beings, of animals and of plants, of all kinds of forms of life. But man is the only one who stands erect and can move, and whose head can walk in the clouds, and whose mind can conceive of the possibility of consciousness. It is an entirely different viewpoint of what man ought to be and could become if he can see it, and if only it could be realized that the solution of what we now call ills of earth, and conditions which we now are living under - sociologically, economically, politically and all the rest, - simply are caused by keeping man in a certain place where he has no chance of developing; and if he only could develop, that then all the rest would fall into a certain relationship which could be understood.

I heard the other day this question of, let's say, prejudice, prejudice that we have at the present time, prejudice against Jews, prejudice against Negroes, prejudice against so-and-so, so-called prejudice in a democracy. And what are we trying to do to make people live together, and sometimes by force of arms, like poor guy down south, young Meredith; or forcing people to live in the same kind of a building, and segregation problems, and the prejudice which constantly exists when I have to hire someone, - and all this on the basis of so-called democracy - never, as long as human beings are the way they are, can ever be solved. And there what we are doing are little palliatives, with a little bit of salve on the wound, without really understanding the cause of the poison in the blood circulation.

So that if man could change, if man could change in this sense, not in the sense of a religion and forming a little bit of a group which again becomes for them nothing else but an ingrown toenail, or sometimes incest, but that he can develop the way he ought to develop, that then with this his variety of prejudices, the variety of different things that now keep people apart from each other, then can be understood in the proper place; and that their accent of living is not on the little superficial relationships, but becomes then for them a question of inner life - and an inner life as understood on the basis of understanding other people in regard to an aim of becoming objective regarding themselves. And because of that, such questions of racial separations and all that, what is the difference: when one looks at; here is a human being striving for becoming aware and awake? As long as I still assume that everybody who is asleep can do everything that they want to do in their sleep, there will never be democracy.

The acknowledgement of superiority can exist if all of us are cognizant of the fact that we are on a road towards something. What difference does it make if a person works on a road here or works on a road here if the road is leading to the possibility of fulfillment for themselves? I don't care if someone is working here who may be very clever and nice and good and with brains, and I am here and I am dumb. But I am also looking at exactly the same thing as this person is. Maybe he is a little closer, but I am also, let's call it, imbibed, inspired; I am affected by the possibility some day, I hope, of course, of reaching there the same way as this

person. And on that basis we can shake hands because the aim is not within ourselves any more; the aim is something outside towards which we strive. So that the solution of democracy, of humanity, of every being that now lives, even including missionary work among the heathen, depends entirely on what I understand of myself as representing life and the acceptance of the responsibility of my life wherever I find it in such a way that I will say, I will, regarding life, do the best I can since I am responsible. And then I understand someone else who also wishes to be responsible.

But you see how necessary it is for this kind of thing to have first a clear picture of what is meant, because if I don't know myself I will continue to make small or big circles on a surface, and I will not get out of it; because in ordinary life there is no possibility of getting out of it. I will stay there unless there is something in me implanted which has a wish towards something away from earth. And only because of that kind of motivation that there is a possibility that I myself could go, arise, let's say; leave earth, provided that what is in me can make contact with something that is also up there, somewhere outside, something that I call higher. And the requirement under which I live, that I'm obliged to answer to is that, assuming for a moment the possibility of that kind of evolution of myself, of any human being who wishes, that in the first place, with this assumption that it could evolve, that I could evolve; I must evolve to something in which I believe that exists.

This is one thing. The second is that I, having belief in such possibility, have in me something of the same kind of quality which is attracted by that what is higher. The third is my work. The third is that I, within the means I have, become open to the possibility of being affected, of that work really - all it means is, by means of relaxation, by means of sensing, by means of coming to myself, by means of purging myself of extraneous thoughts, feelings, movements and so forth, come to a place where that what is now me as magnetic center and holy of the holiest is now contacted by an influence from outside which at the present time cannot pass because I am not transparent enough. So that the real result of work is the creation of a transparency.

It is as if the layers which I now have, which civilization, education, everything that has made me in ordinary life, and with which I have covered myself for my own protection: always such protective layers are opaque. They are impervious to the influence which I know at times for sure, and at other times I suspect exist, which of course is the only reasonable way of looking at one's life, because one cannot say it is a reasonable assumption to simply, after death, what then? Nothing, or no God existing, atheistically? Also, idiotic!

One cannot have a human brain which is not thoughtful about the possibility of what happens after death. What happened to me before birth? Did I exist or not? Is there reincarnation, recurrence, life after life? Is there the possibility of what is sometimes then called Heaven? Is there the possibility of different layers, seven worlds? Is there a possibility of going up towards planetary, solar, Milky Way, etc., etc. as Absolute? Is there something of that kind that I, when I become engaged in thoughts of my own life, that I feel that that is the kind of a secret that I would like to unlock in order to use the knowledge that I then will gain - to make my life in that

way better or at least more understandable for myself, and also more satisfying? So of course when I keep on thinking, and I keep on living, and I keep on experiencing, and I try to find really what is the key and the motivations of myself doing what I have done, and how I do it, and why I cannot do what I really wish to do; that I must come to a conclusion that I am part of something much larger than I am myself; and in that way, if I could only understand it, that is, what is this part that I am in relation to that what is larger, that then in that I will find a possibility of a solution for my own life.

So this is the way one must look, this is the way one must constantly try to see in daily life, in whatever affects one, in whatever inspires one, in whatever is a motivation for oneself, in whatever we call our good moments; to try to put it on such a scale as if I am regarding myself, the judge of seeing that what I do, and what happens with me, as if I am away from that and then can see it in its truthfulness of how it takes place; and what it is that has made me do or not do, think or not think, or feel or not feel certain things that have occurred to me. The enlargement of my world by being able to get away from it and have a good viewpoint - and a viewpoint which becomes then objective, that is, because it is more truthful, because it is more as if I do not see the little point in which I am now so engaged ; but I withdraw and I have a certain form of judgment which is closer to a sense of the Absolute regarding myself - logically leads then to a method which includes such a possibility of being objective regarding myself. And logically then work must appear in the form it appears.

There are many reasons why work of objectivity is the only way. There are many ways of explaining it, why it has to be that way and not any other way, why impartiality must be there, why simultaneity must enter, why seeing and becoming aware must be there; why if I am subject to a time duration from birth till death, and I'm interested in a continuation of that kind of life independent of this time duration, that of course the only logical way of attacking the problem of the movement of a moment is by making a moment stand still and look at it. And again there are other reasons why it is logical to consider the possibility of evolution. But once and for all, when I am convinced that that is what I would like to find out, and that my life as far as I can judge is put on a scale, and I start to weigh it; and I am in my moments of, you might call it, retirement, my moments of silence, my moments when I want to be quiet, when I want to really listen to what takes place in me; and when I am confronted with a variety of different problems in life, ordinary life problems which I cannot solve; that the only solution would be, if I could regarding such problems, could also, could become objective and then see it, then I would see it properly and I would have a judgment that would be worthwhile.

All of this is included in work. I'm talking now as if I, you might say, give a lecture, and it is again - . Time and time again these questions come up in daily life. And we have to learn to see when I have ordinary experiences of myself with others, or how I am thinking and what I am doing, and when I am up against it and I don't know what to do, how can I at such a time introduce something of the ideas of work regarding my ordinary life? How can I when I am affected by anger or by a statement, or by worry, or by certain conditions of

joy and forgetfulness; how then can I at such a time be helped? Or if I look really for guidance that I think I need, how can I get it out of the possibility of what we now call with a general term, objectivity? It's only then at such a time that I will have to put what I now know to the test. And if I cannot then test it out and use it, it is of course no good, because I don't want work just for something that I like to sit on because it is nice and easy. It is a coat; it is something I wear; it is like shoe leather. It is something that has to be worn out. It is something that becomes for me as if physically being exercised. It is something that I must at the time when I really need it most, that it has to be available for me. And therefore if objectivity is not available for me in any form of subjectivity, I have no use for work, and I have no use for trying to wake up. It must be possible at any one time when I'm asleep to be awake, provided I have the key; provided I have at a time when it happens, when I then am fortunate to remember the existence of the possibility of work, that then at that time I have also, even if it is a very small desire, but nevertheless a positive desire to wake up to myself at that moment and to say, "here I am."

If I can do that, and work enables me to do it; and work, if I apply it in that way, never fails; it is always there. Objectivity is always there because moments are always there. It is not something I have to wait for because unfortunately the Eternity Shop is out of stock, has no objectivity. It is present because God, that is for me my awareness, is omnipresent, <u>is</u>. It is not - it is always, <u>it</u> exists in Eternity. In that way it is absolute, and then earth can become at that moment non-earth because it is then in its negation of earth, has become the positive ingredient of Eternity. It is, that is then the moment of time has become timeless because it is free from its dimension.

If God could not be there at the time when I pray with all my heart and mind and myself, my body, if He at such a time, that is if my awareness at such a time fails me, there is no further sense in living, because anything that fails I never will have any confidence in. So reversely if I wish to work, I have to find out that it exists. As long as I keep ideas in my head, and as long as I keep them in my heart, and as long as I believe that they belong to someone else, and as long as I think that whatever I experience is all right for me; but that whatever is given as a remedy is always for another person and not for myself, as long as that happens I am outside the possibility of ever becoming conscious. I have to learn that I wish to become a part of something. I have to learn that that what I am now may not be entirely right. I have to admit or wish to admit that in that what I have always considered right, that I may have been wrong, that at sometimes with all the best of intentions of the world - whichever way it has been that my education brought me to the certain realization of my existence and whatever I may have called ethical values or morality,-that maybe I will start questioning the validity of such concepts for myself, and that I gradually am willing to distill out of that what I am and what I believe in at the present time, that I will question that what I always have considered truth, and I will start by saying that perhaps it is not so, perhaps it is different.

I will make, I have to make the allowance that most likely it is not so. But I will find out, and I will find out by doing that what I know I do, you can say with God's help, if you wish. But if

God is awareness and I am aware, God in all religious sense is with me, with any one of us. And each one can have his own God because each one has his own time. We have all the ingredients in ordinary life in our body, in our functions, to start work with. We have enough of a mind to have a concept and clarity. We have enough of a wish based on a realisation that everything may not be entirely so as we always have seen. We have enough of that to try. We have even sometimes curiosity going over into the wish for adventure. The different motivations why one becomes interested in work-which admittedly is difficult because it goes against my subjectivity, and it goes against many things that I have believed in - that there must be a motivation why I want to do certain things that are difficult; and it is probably because I believe that if it is difficult, that then that what I can gain will be measured by the amount of energy that I have to spend in order to overcome such difficulties so that the value of that what I wish to reach is really worthwhile enough.

Or there may be different motivations why I wish to work, why I wish to find out; why, for exactly the same reason, I have to have some form of ethics and morality and religion in my own life because I'm not satisfied by just living a superficial existence; and that there are of course feelings, and there are certain insights, and at certain times there are aspirations and wish and inspirabion and the wish to create, the wish actually to become alive in the real sense of the word. Maybe sometimes I already know so much about ordinary life, and I have been so disappointed, and I know there is no way in which I can turn. I will run up against exactly the same wall as before. Maybe I'm at the end of my rope in that sense; and maybe that will force me in the direction, I say, "anything will be better than that in which I am." Perhaps it is that kind of a condition. Perhaps it is really that I already know as if I see what might become possible - that I am already living in a hope of reaching something that is much more worthwhile and it will give me a satisfaction of knowing that I belong.

I say it doesn't matter at all whatever the motivations are. It can be because someone else says, "You ought to try." Maybe it is because you have seen certain things in yourself which you didn't like. Maybe you have found that that what you are and that what you would like to overcome, you have no means of overcoming them, and at the last straw you would take something that looks like a possibility as if you could perhaps extricate yourself with your own bootstraps out of the conditions in which you live. Or perhaps religiously you feel that your place is not here but somewhere else.

But whichever way the motivations are, work is there at any one time when one wishes; And don't postpone until tomorrow what you can do today, and what in my opinion your responsibility is regarding your own life, because time as you know it for yourself and as you live it, and as you at the present time are affected by it, that time eats you up entirely, and it eats you up completely at the moment when you die. And then time, that time is satisfied, and it is so satisfied that that time of yours also dies at the same time.

What is it then that takes place, that still I would call aliveness, that something that I say is at times timeless, of which I know that at times it is not subject even to time; because when I am interested in certain things my life takes on a different kind of a color, and I lose sense of time; so I know there is a difference

between them. At the same time I only know my life by means of my time. How can I then when I can separate them, if such a possibility of separation exists, how then can I maintain one and do away with the other, and fulfill then the obligations of both? I eat time in order to live. If I can understand that, if I can see that there is a possibility in daily life of paying attention to my time which now otherwise would eat me, that I eat that; and in that sense my digestion produces in me a certain form of energy because of which then I can continue to live.

This continuation of life must take place in life itself. At the moment I die it is too late. I cannot have any continuation of anything unless at the present time I prepare for the living quarters as it were of that life that I would like to continue. Read the life of Ivan Osokin in order to get a certain picture of what it is that at times can change a person into a different direction; and then he can be released from certain bondages. What is it that could take place in oneself if one wishes to work? And then in wishing to work, what can develop in one? Something of a spiritual body which then could become the container as it were for that part of life now represented by me under my name, and when this body, this physical body dies, that then can continue. But in preparing that kind of mansion, Christ calls it, in Heaven, for which he went to prepare it, if you know what it says in the Bible; that what we try to have as obligation to do as human beings is the preparation of that within oneself which is this spiritual possibility of the continuation of something for which we have now taken the responsibility, and which should not stop at the time when we die; and that in doing this, that our life at the present time takes on another kind of a color because it has an aim. And it is then as if new life has entered in the possibility of not only the continuation, and not for the sake of continuing, but for the sake of actually preparing for that, and now at this time in this life responding to the responsibility of having received life and putting it in the proper light for ourselves, and cherishing it in such a way that it is maintained in its proper relation to all life existing.

Again I say it is not religion. We're talking about human, ordinary living, about human beings with aspiration, with a something in one that can be as a guide tomorrow, the day after, next week, and that can stay with you, on which you can fall back, almost, I would say, with which you can talk, to which you can listen when you are quiet; and that development within oneself that becomes then for you sacred, holy of the holiest, not necessarily being shown to anyone else, but from which standpoint you start to direct your activities, your non-activities, your thoughts and feelings so that they become proper to yourself as a human being; and that you become what you ought to be, that is harmonious, controlled, able to do, really, to think, to feel properly, as you should, as it is almost a command. Although one doesn't want to say it is a command since that involves punishment.

And perhaps, who knows that one is going through purgatory if one doesn't follow such a command; or that, if to use simply the old phrase, that I go to hell after I die, or perhaps live already in hell when I am alive now. There is something in a possibility of understanding in one's life at the present time a motivation of why

I am alive and why I wish to respond to the possibility of that what I now know is my life; so that even that what I wish to create, that what I wish to live for, that what I want to try to accomplish in any relationship with anyone else is again proper, without my selfishness, my vanity, without my self-love and everything that I call now vices, but which I don't do anything about simply because I'm half-hearted; that gradually such things are sluffed off from my existence, and that I can emerge as something that really has value in existence for myself. So that at the end of the day, at the end of a year, at the end of a lifetime I can look, if I could, myself in the face, and I will say, "I've done what I could have done." Perhaps if at such a time I face other things, forces of a higher nature, sometimes maybe I say if I face God, that at least I needn't be ashamed of myself.

We have to work; there is no question about it. Either I do it consciously or I am worked on, and I just the same furnish the material that is necessary for the maintenance of earth. Don't make any mistake. Unconscious or conscious, we are all in that kind of a boat, and no one can take himself out of it even if he wishes, unless he could become conscious and in that way free himself without forgetting the necessity of his own payment. We have that obligation. I say, like it or not, believe it or not. I do not care if you believe it. It is for you, if anything exists for you that can give you more satisfaction in your life, take it; don't wait. If it doesn't, don't take it; continue any way you wish. Gurdjieff would say, "Stir water until it is thick." There is life. Some day you will face it. Everybody must face it. We can face it every day if we wish. The sooner we face life in all its reality, in all its cruelty, in all its difficulty, the sooner the better because it means that there is still the possibility while one is alive to do something. And otherwise if one dies, what , what happens when one dies? Think of that. What happens to all of us? Do you know?

Read, think about observance. What is it, objectively? Work on yourself. Partdolgduty, a duty, an obligation. You find yourself with life. Like it or not, you are; you now have to live. Make the best of it to the extent that you can, to the extent that you are willing to sacrifice, to the extent that you are willing to try to understand yourself. It is you, every one of us, who is in the saale. Every one of us is being weighed. Every one of us will be found - there is no mistake - will be found whatever we are. At that time there is no hypocrisy; at that time there is no rationalization. At that time there is no possibility of fooling anyone, that is at that time that I face my conscience; and then there is nothing between us but clarity.

I hope you work; I hope you read; I hope you get together; I hope you talk. I hope you explain to each other; I hope you relate experiences. I hope you get somewhere; I hope that you will not forget; I hope that you continue. Try to live the only way you must live, to be serious and honest, to try to remember yourself. Try to pray that you can be what you ought to be.

So maybe in four weeks I will be here again. At that time bring many others. The level of a group depends on what one brings. The more varied it can be, the better the group can be. So bring, in all simplicity. Try to live. Good-night, everybody. Margo, a little coffee.